"To promote Christian ideals for agriculture and rural life; to interpret the spiritual and religious values which inhere in the processes of agriculture and the relationships of rural life; to magnify and dignify the rural church; to provide a means of fellowship and cooperation among rural agencies: *Toward a Christian Rural Civilization.*"

The Christian Rural Fellowship Bulletin

Published by The Christian Rural Fellowship, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

No. 176 October 1952

LEBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

THE UNITED STATES FARMER AND THE WORLD AROUND HIM

By John J. Haggerty*

As director of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations (OFAR), I find myself daily concerned with the several ways in which the foreign situation affects the U.S. farmer, and the ways in which U.S. farmers can and do influence the direction and force of world events. Therefore, when Ray Penn called me from Wisconsin to ask if I would substitute for Senator Sparkman, I accepted with what might have been considered unseemly alacrity, because I believe that the general subject of my remarks is of great importance to American agriculture and will become increasingly so in the coming years.

The title which I suggested at that time was "The United States Farmer and the World around Him." I did not know then that the topic for this morning was "United States Interest in World Land Tenure Reforms." Now it may take me a little time to work around to the point of tying my subject into the morning's topic, but I hope that by the time I have finished you will see the connection not only between land tenure reform and my subject but also the interrelationships among the several items I shall touch upon.

Briefly, as we in OFAR see the problems in our day-to-day work, there are three major areas in which the U.S. farmer is brought face to face with world problems and comes to grips with the great issues of the day. These are, by way of outline of my further remarks: first, as a producer of food, one of the major weapons against totalitarian aggression; second, in the area of international trade, without which neither our own economy nor those we have spent billions of dollars to reestablish can survive; and finally, in the area of technical assistance, including whatever is in our power to bring land tenure reform, in its broadest sense, to the less favored farmers in other parts of the world.

I hope that when I have finished it will have been made clear that the United States interest in world land tenure reform is a vital one, and one in

---

* Mr. Haggerty is Director of the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, U.S. Department of Agriculture. This talk was given at the annual meeting of the American Farm Economic Association, Urbana, Illinois, August 30, 1952, and is reprinted by kind permission of the author.

which the U.S. farmer has an uncommon interest because it is out of his own experiences and accomplishments that we must draw the wisdom and the strength for the struggle over land tenure reform that lies ahead.

A. THE AMERICAN FARMER AS A PRODUCER OF FOOD

The U.S. farmer stands in the first order of battle against aggression Those of you who are younger than I am may not remember the slogan of the first World War, "Food Will Win the War -- Save It." Some of you who are older than I may have had a hand in coining that slogan, and almost certainly there are men i this room who helped to plan and carry out the food production and conservation programs of that era. There is hardly a man here, I suspect, who has not played some part in the farm production goals program during World War II and in the er of troubled peace which has succeeded it and in which we are still enmeshed. Yo know from personal participation the extent to which American agricultural produ tion and the disposition of our crops are planned with an eye to the requirement of those other friendly countries whose destinies are irrevocably linked with ou and ours with theirs.

There is not time, nor for this audience should there be the necessity to review the decisive contribution of U.S. agriculture to the reconstruction of the war-torn economies of Europe and Asia through UNRRA, the most gigantic relie and rehabilitation program in man's history, or the Marshall Plan, wherein we un dertook to bind up the national economic wounds of friend and foe alike and to t their feet and their faces firmly in the direction of those democratic instituti without which there is no peace worthy of attainment. I shall not review that h tory nor burden you with statistics. You all know the general measure of succes which has been achieved, and you know where and why we have failed.

I might, however, briefly mention that it was the timely extension of U.S. economic aid to Greece and Turkey which made it possible to check the sprea of totalitarian aggression in that part of the world before it reached the key waterways of the eastern Mediterranean. Again, it was U.S. economic aid, consisting primarily of one-half million tons of food and feedstuffs from American farms, which prevented the almost certain collapse of the Yugoslav government fo lowing the disastrous drought of 1950. Had that occurred there was every likeli hood that the forces of aggression would again have stood on the Adriatic, casti their evil shadow over Italy, Greece, and the Suez Canal and flanking our positi in Austria and Germany. In the same year, 1951, three million tons of American wheat and sorghums (83.7 million bushels of wheat, 19.8 million bushels of sorgh were made available to India in order to avert a famine which might have entaile the loss of this great free nation to the forces of aggression.

It is a very significant and fortunate circumstance, not only for Amer but for all of the free world, that in these times U.S. agriculture is not only able and equipped to meet these emergency foreign food requirements but that co- operation and understanding between the U.S. farmer and his government have been developed to a sufficiently high degree to permit such obligations to be underta and carried out. I shall not dwell on the amazing record of U.S. farm productio in the face of reduced labor force, relatively constant area of land in crops, a increasing costs. I am sure most of you know these details far better than I, a the Bureau of Agricultural Economics people present here have undoubtedly been o this ground with you during the past three days. The point I wish to make is th U.S. food can stop and has stopped aggression in its tracks, not once but many times in every major world region within recent years, and it almost certainly w be called upon to do again, sometime, somewhere, as the need arises.

When a man or a nation is hungry to the point of desperation, there is a powerful appeal to the doctrine that security can be attained by surrendering liberty to an all-powerful central regime. Personal or national liberty tends to become an empty slogan not worth defending in the face of hunger, misery, hopeless poverty, and economic despair. American food produced on American farms can make the difference in strengthening the will of people to stand up against aggression, both within their own countries and from outside, and we may anticipate continuation of this role of the U.S. farmer as a producer of food, the chief weapon against aggression.

B. THE NECESSITY OF FOREIGN MARKETS

American agriculture is geared up to move a substantial portion of its total output into foreign markets, but under normal trade conditions this movement cannot take place and does not take place unless our foreign customers have the dollars with which to buy. Most of us very clearly remember the economic depression into which this country had fallen in the early 1930's when exports of farm crops fell off, thereby necessitating a cutback in agricultural production all along the line. Acreages planted to cotton, wheat, and our other major export commodities were greatly reduced under the original agricultural adjustment program in spite of the unsatisfied want for those commodities abroad. It is one of the most elementary tenets of economic science, however, that a want does not constitute a demand without the ability to pay. So farmers in the United States were broke, their lands and homes hopelessly mortgaged, and foreclosure riots occurred right here in the heart of the cornbelt. The economic depression of the 1930's was not limited to the United States; it was world-wide in its scope. The products of farms and factories were backed up in the areas in which they were produced.

To what extent this was due to the fact that the doors of trade were, to a large extent, closed by protectionist measures both here and abroad would be rather difficult to establish. We do know that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements legislation first enacted in the United States in 1934 was hailed both at home and abroad as a promise that trade might be expanded by the removal, on a reciprocal basis, of those impediments to trade created by governments for protectionist or other reasons.

Since World War II and undoubtedly strongly influenced by the programs of economic aid which this government has extended to many of our traditional trading partners, we have succeeded in recapturing and, in many instances, exceeding our prewar foreign markets for farm products. In the last year of record, 1951, we exported thirty-four per cent of our cotton, twenty-three per cent of our tobacco, forty-eight per cent of our wheat, forty-five per cent of our dried whole milk, twenty-eight per cent of our soybeans, and substantial quantities of other farm products including fresh and dried fruits. In 1951 total exports of farm products were five and one-half times by value and more than double by volume what they were in 1935-1939.

Maintenance of these foreign markets is essential not only to continued prosperity of American agriculture but also to the maintenance of a high level of economic activity and full employment. We have learned in the past that the American economy as a whole cannot prosper if agriculture is in a depression.

The extent to which foreign sales of farm products depends upon reciprocal trade has been largely obscured in recent years by the war and by the relief and rehabilitation programs which I have mentioned. It should be obvious,

however, that unless we are prepared to continue indefinitely to subsidize our exports -- in effect, to give them away -- we must give consideration to the opportunities for our trading partners to earn the dollars with which to buy our products. If we want to sell, we are going to have to buy.

Now that the economies of the European nations are again reestablished at or above prewar levels of activity, it is to be expected that programs of American economic aid will be tapered off. Sooner or later trade will have to find its way back into the traditional commercial channels, an event generally desired by the countries of Europe. While our so-called "give away" programs have been gratefully received by these countries during the period when their economies were badly disrupted by war, they do not want to be perpetual mendicants depending upon the scraps from our table. They want to be able to stand on their own feet, to sell the products of their labor, and to buy their needs in the market place. They want to trade for the same reasons we do and must, if our economies are to continue to expand. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that U.S. agriculture has a vital stake in expanding rather than shrinking world trade in farm products.

It is equally clear that U.S. agriculture must be constantly vigilant against the wave of protectionism which appears to be mounting all around us, both at home and abroad. American agriculture must come to see that our foreign customers will be able to buy our products only to the extent that they can get possession of the necessary dollars with which to pay. These dollars must be earned, for the most part, by making sales in the U.S. market.

While the American farmer's interest in expanding trade might seem to be, from the foregoing, primarily a selfish one, there is a broader sense in which this selfish interest coincides with the aspirations of the free world. We have, and rightly so, poured billions of dollars into the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the economies of Europe and certain Asiatic countries under the Marshall Plan. The primary purpose of this program has been to strengthen the will of these peoples to resist the threat of totalitarianism both from within and from without. It has been a part of the broader effort to strengthen the forces of democracy in the free world. It should be plain, however, that this battle can still be lost unless we can hold out to these countries the necessary assurances of trade and intercourse which will guarantee the expansion of their economies on a sound commercial basis, thereby giving to them the final guarantee of the independence which they and we fought side by side to assure.

C. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND LAND REFORM

Finally, U.S. agriculture is called upon for technical assistance, to contribute scientific and practical knowledge and technology to the less developed nations of the world in order to help accelerate their rate of economic progress.

The whole concept of this program, known the world over as Point IV, after the fourth point of the President's inaugural address in 1949, is to help peoples to help themselves in the more rapid development of their natural resources and of their own skills and production practices. In many areas of the world, especially in the Orient, this program holds out for millions of people for the first time the assurance of the elementary right to live. The major emphasis is placed on increased productivity, especially of food, so that there will be enough to go around and no one need starve if he is willing and able to work. In these programs of agricultural technical assistance the main lines of

endeavor are in the three fields of research, resident education, and extension, a triumvirate long established in this country but virtually unknown in many parts of the world.

Of these, extension, as we know it, is usually the missing link. Scientific or practical knowledge knows no nationality and no frontier but there must be channels and facilities for its dissemination. In the Point IV program, therefore, we are emphasizing the development of agricultural extension programs in order to bring existing knowledge down to the individual farmer or peasant who works the land.

Some measure of the immensity of this task may be gained from the fact that in one country alone, India, our Point IV program and the Ford Foundation, working together, are financing an extension training program and helping to establish seventy large extension projects which embrace 21,000 villages. But India, alone, has 500,000 such villages. In the American technical assistance program we now have sixty extension agents in India and contemplate a total of one hundred, within the limits of budget in which we have to work. The government of India with its twenty-six constituent states or provinces has now established central extension services at the federal and state levels patterned much after our own.

Today, as I speak to you, the Commissioner of Extension for India and almost all of the twenty-six state directors are in this country on a fact-finding study tour of our extension methods and practices to see what values they can derive from our experience for application to the problems of increasing farm production and improving rural living in their country. They know it is a long-time job. They are laying a firm foundation, but it will be years before they can hope to have an adequate corps of trained agents to reach an effective portion of their one-half million villages and 250 millions of rural people.

Nevertheless, they are getting on with the job and so are the leaders of other free countries such as Pakistan, Iran, Indonesia, and many others. Some of these nations have gained their national independence only within the past few years and are facing problems no less agonizing then those which Washington, Jefferson, and the other founding fathers went through in this country 150 and more years ago.

You may be wondering what all this has to do with land reform. As Americans we believe that ownership of the land by the man who works it carries the best assurance of political stability, orderly economic and cultural progress, and the march of humanity toward true democracy. We believe that not only out of our own national experience but we know in our hearts it is right. We know it from our observations in other lands where the land-working peasantry had been ground under the heel of feudalism and slavery for a thousand years before the white man first set foot on the American continent. And we know it from lands where those conditions still exist today. It is no mere coincidence that these are, by and large, the same lands and countries which today teeter on the brink and where our government and theirs are cooperating in programs of economic development and land reform before it is too late. The U.S. interest in world land tenure reform is inextricably tied up with the basic question of our national security.

In the same way and for the same reasons that we recognize the need for economic progress in the less developed areas of the world, we must also recognize the vital necessity of land tenure reform for, unless the fruits of his labor

can be assured to the land-working peasant through equitable and acceptable systems of land tenure, broadly defined, unless he can achieve the status and dignity of a free man in a free world, all the economic and military aid we have poured out and can pour out to safeguard the free world against the insiduous poison of totalitarianism will be as so much water down the drain.

We could mount guns wheel to wheel across the belly of Europe or of Asia or of America and they would not stop the infiltration of totalitarianism into the minds of men. We can conceivably double or treble the production of agriculture and of industry. We can pile wheat on top of corn on top of cabbage in abundance, to the point of world surplus and economic collapse. And it will be of no avail in the battle of our generation unless we give to the people who work the land a vital stake in democracy, something to live for and, if need be, something to die for.

I do not mean to imply that the American institution of the family farm is a cure-all for the evils of the world. Perhaps there are areas where the deep rooted tradition of the people and their culture incline them toward collectivism. The important thing is that they be permitted to exercise the right of self-determination, protected in that right not only by their governments but by their own vigilance and their own organized efforts in their own behalf. I believe it is in this latter field that U.S. agriculture has its greatest contribution to make out of our experience of recent years.

During our lifetime the American farmer movement has come of age. It has reached a point of maturity wherein the seventeen per cent of our population who work the land and feed the rest of us have organized in their own self-interest and in the national interest to assure that degree of well-being, economic incentive, and security of tenure on American farms which is essential to continued progress in productivity. The American farmer, like the American laboring man in industry, has erected around himself a fortress of practical militant democracy. The U.S. farmer has not only numerous government programs in which he participates through his local committees and which assure to him the research findings, the material facilities, and the economic inducements for all-out production. He also has his own farm organizations in the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the Farmers' Union, and the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives to maintain vigilance and defend his interests, if need be, in the halls of his government.

I do not believe it is in the power of the U.S. government to impose democracy or liberty on any people, including our own, but we can demonstrate to the world how American democracy works in practice and in principle. While the practices may not everywhere apply, the principle of self-determination is universal. Until this principle is generally accepted throughout the world, the United States as its chief advocate would be foolhardy to relax its vigilance against those evil powers who oppose it. Nowhere in the whole structure of human institutions is this principle of self-determination more loaded with good or with evil for the future of mankind than in the basic problem of land tenure reform.

It lies largely with American agriculture, therefore, to provide the spiritual and technical leadership for a sustained world-wide farmer movement, to gain for the man who tills the soil the status and dignity of a free man in a free world and a proper share of the fruits of his labor -- all of those things which go to make up better rural living and the promise of a better life for his son than he himself enjoys.

-- Printed in the U.S.A.